



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,808	09/30/2003	Thomas Solderits	BP-87	2226
7590 Friedrich Kueffner Suite 910 317 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10017				
			EXAMINER LAO, LUN S	
			ART UNIT 2615	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/675,808
Filing Date: September 30, 2003
Appellant(s): SOLDERITS, THOMAS

Friedrich Kueffner
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 03-25-2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 10-16-2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are allowed. Claim 9 remains rejected.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on 01-22-2008 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Killion et al. (US PAT. 6,151,399) 11-21-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Killion (US PAT. 6,151,399).

Consider claim 9, Killion teaches a microphone having a sensitivity stipulated within narrow limits (sensitivity of the equalized directional microphone), comprising:

- a microphone capsule (reads on cartridge (30, 20) in fig. 5);
- an amplifier (160 in fig.5); and
- a network of passive components (61A-61E) allocated to the amplifier, at least one of the passive components being disconnected (61A, 61B, 61D and 61E disconnected, as shown in fig. 5), wherein the network of passive components and the amplifier are mounted on a single circuit board (60) (see figs. 4A, 5 and col. 8, line 10-55).

(10) Response to Argument

1. Appellant's arguments regarding claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are moot in view of their allowed status.
2. Regarding whether claim 9 is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) by Killion (Brief, page 5)

Appellant alleged that independent claim 9 is identical to independent claim 5 except that the amplifier and the network of passive components are mounted in a circuit board (Brief, page 5, 2nd paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The current claim 9 and claim 5 read as follows.

9. A microphone having a sensitivity stipulated within narrow limits, comprising:	5. A microphone having a sensitivity stipulated within narrow limits, comprising:
	a housing;
A microphone capsule;	a microphone capsule;
an amplifier; and	an amplifier; and
a network of passive components allocated to the amplifier, at least one of the passive components being disconnected, wherein the network of passive components and the amplifier are mounted on a <u>single circuit board</u> .	a network of passive components allocated to the amplifier, at least one of the passive components being disconnected, <u>wherein disconnection of the disconnected component occurs by destruction of an electrical feed line of the component by a laser beam directed through openings in the housing.</u>

Clearly, claim 5 does not include the critical and argued limitation "wherein disconnection of the disconnected component occurs by destruction of an electrical feed line of the component by a laser beam directed through openings in the housing."

On page 6, starting from the 2nd paragraph, appellant alleged that the Killian reference fails to teach the disconnecting "which according to the present invention, includes destroying the passive components with a laser beam directed through openings in the housing." As evidenced from the side by side listing above, claim 9 does not require destroying the passive components with a laser beam directed through openings in the housing. Therefore, the argument is not persuasive.

From page 6, 3rd paragraph to page 7, 1st paragraph, appellant alleged the prior art does not teach conducting a laser beam through an opening in the housing in order to destroy a passive component in order to alter amplification of this amplifier.

The examiner's position is that this feature is not recited in claim 9 and thus the argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2614

On page 7, in the 2nd paragraph, appellant alleged that the European reference 0 451 549 A is more relevant with respect to the present invention. It appears unclear whether appellant believed that a prior art rejection should have been considered.

As discussed in detailed in the rejection, Killion teaches, among others, a network of passive components 61A-61E allocated to the amplifier 160. As shown in fig. 5, passive components 61A, 61B, 61D and 61E are disconnected and only 61C is connected. Therefore, Killion meets a network of passive components allocated to the amplifier, at least one of the passive components being disconnected, as recited in claim 9.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejection should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Lun-See, Lao

/Lun-See Lao/

Examiner, Art Unit 2615

June 7, 2008

Conferees:

Art Unit: 2614

/Vivian Chin/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615

/Curtis Kuntz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.